United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.1

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
12 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(*Item 3 (b)*)

Evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3)

1. At its fourth and fifth meetings, on 4 and 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the OIOS report, noting its comprehensive nature and usefulness. A specific reference was made to the user-friendliness of the recommendations format utilized in the report.

4. Several delegations expressed their wish to utilize evaluation data to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the important work undertaken by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Furthermore, many delegations underscored the important work carried out by the Office with regard to the coordination of humanitarian responses; fundraising and managing of humanitarian response funds;

Please recycle

and the provision of support, in particular for the implementation of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee transformative agenda. At the same time, a few delegations sought clarification as to who had endorsed the transformative agenda.

5. As to the assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, clarification was sought by several delegations regarding the availability of performance data. Specifically, a number of delegations questioned why OIOS had not included a recommendation for a database to be developed if, as reflected in the OIOS report, "no single data source allows for quantification of the degree to which the international humanitarian system has improved efficiency, effectiveness or the final impact upon those affected by natural and man-made disasters".

6. Many delegations commented on the need to strengthen coordination between Inter-Agency Standing Committee partners in order to provide better humanitarian assistance. Harmonization in the United Nations system was also referred to by some delegations. A few delegations noted that a key area of the work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs concerned close cooperation with host Governments based on humanitarian principles. Furthermore, queries were raised as to how coordination could be improved, particularly in the light of the comment in the OIOS report that "a number of stakeholders point to coordination within the United Nations as being complicated by systemic governance and accountability arrangements, at times being fragmented among entities with separate governing bodies and overlapping mandates that have differing approaches to the exercise of centralized or delegated authority".

7. A few delegations commented on the importance of the concept of resilience in humanitarian assistance. Moreover, they sought clarification on the role of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in resilience work and raised questions as to why the OIOS report did not include a recommendation on resilience.

8. Delegations noted the increasing need to provide humanitarian support in the context of disasters. In this regard, further clarification was requested regarding why there had been a decline in the percentage of funding for humanitarian assistance needs in official development assistance.

9. A few delegations also sought clarification regarding the extent to which the OIOS report identified a lack of clarity about the role of the regional offices of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and about what that Office and Member States should do to improve clarity. In addition, clarification was sought as to why, at the national level, the Humanitarian Coordinator was not a staff member of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Moreover, clarification was sought about the surge mechanisms and about the reasons why the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs did not have aggregate data on the timeliness of regional office surge deployment.

Conclusions and recommendations

10. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly take note of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2013/3).**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.2

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
20 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit

(*Item 5*)

Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system

1. At its fifth meeting, on 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system" (A/67/867), as well as the comments thereon of the Secretary-General and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) (A/67/867/Add.1).

2. Inspector Tadanori Inomata introduced the JIU report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee. A representative of the CEB secretariat introduced the report containing the comments of the Secretary-General and CEB.

Discussion

3. A number of delegations generally supported the findings and recommendations of the report. In particular, delegations expressed appreciation with the richness of the information and excellent analyses provided as well as the concise summary of actions proposed for Member States and executive heads of organizations concerned.

4. Several delegations expressed satisfaction at having JIU reports before the Committee for review following the absence of such reports over the past years,

Please recycle

which weakened the coordinating role of the Committee as mandated by the General Assembly.

5. Many delegations stressed the role of the Committee in system-wide coordination among programmes of the United Nations system organizations. In addition, views were expressed that the report of JIU coincided with the aim of the Organization to provide a global governance framework on humanitarian operations in the system and had provided the Committee with a timely opportunity to strengthen its function with respect to humanitarian operations. Some delegations were of the view that the report should also be considered by the Economic and Social Council at its humanitarian segment and by the Second and Third committees of the General Assembly.

6. Clarification was sought by some delegations as to the scope of the report in relation to past reports prepared by JIU addressing similar subjects. A number of delegations queried where they could find information on the effect of previous recommendations in JIU reports in this domain, where the United Nations system organizations stood and how past recommendations could be compared with those that had been put forward this time. Views were expressed regarding guidance needed to understand the degree of success of past recommendations in relation to the current ones. Delegations expressed positive comments regarding the web-based follow-up system of recommendations made by JIU.

7. Some delegations sought clarification regarding the methodology used to carry out the review, for example, the extent to which on-the-spot interviews and ad hoc inquiries had been carried out and the use of questionnaires. The delegations noted the wide scope of the review, aimed at identifying in a comprehensive way the numerous funding mechanisms of humanitarian operations within the United Nations system. A delegation further noted according to paragraph 8 of the report that the methodology applied for collecting data on the subject under review had included, inter alia, travel by the Inspector himself to several locations in different geographical areas. The delegation was of the view that the collection of data and conduct of interviews should take place through the most economical means of communication.

8. Several delegations expressed views and sought clarification regarding the predictability and the assured basis of funding, including the use of regular and core resources versus extrabudgetary and earmarked contributions. A number of delegations queried why the CEB organizations were keen on the role of cash and in-kind contributions from the private sector and individuals during major humanitarian crises.

9. Some delegations underlined the civilian character of humanitarian assistance, while noting the possibility that military assets might be used in humanitarian operations. The delegations also explored an approach that would develop separate analyses and different governance frameworks for the delivery of assistance to respond to natural disasters and complex emergencies.

10. Many delegations stressed the need for smooth transition financing through the stages of emergency, early recovery, recovery through reconstruction and strengthening of resilience to disasters. Views were expressed that the dichotomy between humanitarian assistance and development aid, including early recovery activities, should be overcome. Some delegations held the view that humanitarian

financing was not confined to developing countries, referring to the recent nuclear and natural disasters in Japan and to other natural disasters in Central Europe. A few delegations were concerned about the possible impact of the growth in humanitarian assistance on the overall availability of official development assistance. Many delegations expressed interest in identifying a means to better combine development aid with humanitarian assistance in a proper way so as not to duplicate the use of both resources, and reflected on the feasibility of drawing on lessons of experience from the integrated strategic plans and frameworks of the United Nations integrated missions as well as the Common Humanitarian Action Plans and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes of the United Nations country teams.

11. A number of delegations expressed appreciation in principle for the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report, in particular recommendations 2, 6 and 8 aimed at facilitating the financing of humanitarian operations in the field, and noted the intention of JIU to present them to the agencies dealing with humanitarian assistance. A number of delegations expressed interest in developing, as reflected in recommendation 6 of the report, a system-wide policy for the United Nations organizations to provide capacity-building assistance for national insurance schemes with the necessary synergy among them. With regard to recommendation 8, some delegations expressed the preference that better use be made of existing processes and warned against establishing another bureaucratic process.

Conclusions and recommendations

12. **The Committee took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system (A/67/867) and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in the report.**

13. **The Committee further recommended that, while endorsing recommendation 1, the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to replace the phrase "disaster-prone countries and countries in fragile situations" with the phrase "countries emerging from conflicts or recovering from natural disasters".**

14. **The Committee noted the wide scope of the review, which aimed to identify in a comprehensive manner the funding mechanisms for humanitarian operations within the United Nations system, and the Committee appreciated the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report of JIU aimed at providing a strategic planning framework for financing humanitarian operations.**

15. **The Committee further noted that in the process of collecting data, the most effective and efficient methodology should be applied.**

16. **The Committee recommended that JIU continue to monitor the implementation of its recommendations as approved by the relevant intergovernmental bodies in order to ensure the effectiveness of humanitarian action.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.3

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
20 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015
(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Programme 15
Economic and social development in Africa

1. At its 17th meeting, on 17 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

2. The Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) introduced the programme and responded to queries raised during the Committee's consideration of the programme.

Discussion

3. Support and appreciation were expressed for programme 15, Economic and social development in Africa, contained in the report on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75). Views were expressed that the changes proposed adequately reflected the framework overwhelmingly endorsed at the forty-sixth session of ECA, held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, on 25 and 26 March 2013, and that

Please recycle

ECA was embarking on an ambitious and challenging agenda which required the full support of Member States. Member States expressed their support for the restructuring of ECA to make it more effective. The structure was well organized. It was part of Africa's renaissance and represented what the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) wished to see. The context of the nine subprogrammes fully reflected the concerns of the African Union.

4. Views were expressed regarding infrastructure and trade, and the movement of goods between landlocked countries and ports. One example of a major infrastructure project in Africa was the East African Corridor. Member States queried ECA as to any ongoing infrastructure development projects to further facilitate trade and development. ECA was also queried about the extent of help in trade and services provided to Member States within the context of ECA support to regional economic communities.

5. Delegations expressed the need for the Commission to continue to provide support for the regional integration programmes in Africa being undertaken by the regional economic communities.

6. Delegations also appreciated that, despite the progress made in the areas of trade in goods and services, it had been noted that many challenges to the work in trade facilitation remained, especially owing to the lack of reliable hard infrastructure in the region.

7. Some delegations stressed the need for the Commission and other partners, such as the African Development Bank and the World Bank, to continue to provide support so as to complement the efforts of regional economic communities in infrastructure, in particular the railroad and highway connectivities, as a necessary element for trade facilitation and linkage to other key sectors of the economies, such as agriculture.

8. Views were also expressed as to whether ECA was able to capture the impact of its development projects and whether the indicators of achievement were appropriately measuring how the subprogrammes were accomplishing their objectives. For example, subprogramme 6, Gender and women in development, had indicators that seemed to measure progress and knowledge of women's issues instead of focusing on the objective of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment.

9. Concern was expressed about the provision by ECA of support to least developed countries, as there was no reference in the biennial programme plan to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Istanbul, Turkey. Member States expressed views about the possibility of strengthening ECA efforts and support to least developed countries, and whether initiatives could be further exploited in that regard. The view was also expressed that ECA should provide equal support to both least developed countries and landlocked developing countries.

10. It was observed that the ECA programme of work should seek to eradicate poverty instead of reducing poverty. Member States queried ECA as to why it had not gone further to include strategies on eliminating poverty altogether in the programme of work.

11. It was also observed that one of the Commission's goals as part of its strategy was to graduate countries to middle-income status. Some delegations sought clarification about the challenges and pitfalls of bringing countries from low- to middle-income status.

12. Member States expressed the view that multiple studies had been carried out under subprogramme 9, Social development policy, and questioned ECA about the need for additional research and studies. The view was expressed that ECA should use existing studies for the implementation of its programme of work.

13. The view was also expressed that ECA was lacking focus on energy issues and that more attention should be given to that area.

14. Member States expressed concern about the changes to the biennial programme plan owing to the restructuring of the organization and that at least a couple paragraphs had not been included in the overall orientation or the strategies of each subprogramme to explain the changes.

15. It was observed that the report referred to consultations on a post-2015 development agenda as one of the reasons for the restructuring of the organization. Member States observed that the consultations were ongoing and questioned how ECA could incorporate the results of the consultations into the programme of work.

16. Member States expressed their views on the importance of accurate statistical data that would enable ECA to plan and implement its programme of work.

17. Some delegations queried ECA on subprogramme 6, Gender and women in development, and its interaction with the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, which was not mentioned in the biennial programme plan. Member States also sought clarification about the reference to providing support for gender-sensitive strategies for building and sustaining Africa's digital economy in the context of subprogramme 3, Innovations, technologies and management of Africa's natural resources.

Conclusions and recommendations

18. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 15, Economic and social development in Africa, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75).**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
20 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(*Item 3 (b)*)

Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/AC.51/2013/5)

1. At its seventh and ninth meetings, on 6 and 11 June 2013, the Committee had before it the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the Evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/AC.51/2013/5).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and representatives of OIOS and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) responded to questions raised by the Committee on procedural issues.

Discussion

3. Many delegations raised procedural questions regarding the submission of a report that was not consistent with the recommendation contained in paragraph 66 of the previous report of the Committee (A/66/16), which had been endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8. Delegations therefore questioned whether the Committee should consider the report, regardless of whether it was interesting or useful.

4. Clarification was sought regarding why the mandated report had not been produced. Following the responses provided by the Secretariat and, notably, the interpretation as to the authority for such a programme evaluation of UNHCR, a

Please recycle

number of delegations expressed the view that there needed to be coordination between OIOS and UNHCR so that the work of the Committee was not affected. Views were expressed, in particular, that the quantum of resources, whether from the programme budget or from extrabudgetary sources, could not be the basis on which the programme evaluation was or was not to be carried out.

5. The view was expressed that the non-submission of the requested report had to be seen in the context of the issues raised in another report on evaluation currently before the Committee (A/68/70), which highlighted the "lack of an evaluation culture" in the Organization. The view was also expressed that no entity of the United Nations fell outside the need to improve.

6. Some delegations saw the need to reiterate the existing mandate for the report to be submitted, while other delegations expressed the view that that was not necessary, as the existing mandate remained valid and must be complied with.

7. The Chairman summarized the procedural concerns raised by delegations during the discussion regarding the deviation of the contents of the report from what had been sought by the General Assembly and elaborated on a number of options as a way forward. Moreover, given the delicate situation as well as having recognized that delegations needed time to thoroughly review and discuss, among themselves, the way forward, the Chairman indicated he would provide time for delegations to formulate appropriate conclusions and recommendations to the Assembly.

8. A view was expressed regarding the evaluation capacity at UNHCR, in particular that evaluations should be conducted by qualified staff and should show value for money. A view was also expressed generally accepting the recommendations contained in the report.

Conclusions and recommendations

9. **The Committee was deeply concerned that the required programme evaluation report on UNHCR, as mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 66/8, had not been submitted to the Committee.**

10. **The Committee was also concerned about the lack of UNHCR cooperation with OIOS. Equally, the Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the fact that, in the absence of the ability to prepare the mandated report, OIOS had not sought further guidance on that problem and instead had prepared and submitted to the Committee an alternative report for which it had no specific mandate.**

11. **The Committee was further concerned that, despite the provisions on inspection and evaluation contained in General Assembly resolution 48/218 B, it was only upon the discussion of the issue in the Committee that UNHCR had agreed to cooperate with OIOS for a programme evaluation.**

12. **The Committee strongly recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to entrust OIOS with conducting, as soon as possible, the required programme evaluation, pursuant to the above-mentioned resolution, and to submit the report to the Committee for Programme and Coordination during its fifty-fifth session in 2015. The report entitled "Review of the evaluation capacity of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (E/AC.51/2013/5) would be considered in conjunction.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
21 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit

(Item 5)

1. The Committee expressed satisfaction for the return of Joint Inspection Unit reports to be considered by the Committee after their absence in recent years and reaffirmed that one of the key mandates of the Committee was to assist the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly on coordination questions, as reflected in the recommendation adopted at its 52nd session urging the Joint Inspection Unit to intensify its efforts to introduce relevant reports to the Committee.

2. The Committee emphasized the need for implementation of all the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit which have been endorsed by intergovernmental bodies and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to invite the executive heads of the participating organizations to provide their relevant intergovernmental bodies with the reasons for the delay or non-implementation of the Joint Inspection Unit recommendations addressed to them.

13-37097 (E) 250613

Please recycle

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.6

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
24 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Programme 12
Human settlements

1. At its 15th meeting, on 14 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

2. The Executive Director of the United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat) introduced the programme and responded to queries raised during the Committee's consideration of the programme.

Discussion

3. Support was expressed for programme 12, Human settlements, of the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of UN-Habitat. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the incorporation of the recommendations of the Committee, clearly elaborating the revisions, and reflecting, in the biennial programme plan, the six-year strategic plan 2014-2019 as approved by the Governing Council of UN-Habitat. Some delegations noted the

13-37135 (E) 250613

Please recycle

incorporation of experiences, lessons learned and best practices in the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015.

4. The view was expressed that the cooperation and collaboration of UN-Habitat with other United Nations organizations in executing its programme of work was important. Clarification was sought regarding the collaboration of UN-Habitat with partners outside the United Nations system and on how synergies are created between UN-Habitat and other United Nations structures as a result of such collaboration.

5. Clarification was sought on the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues, such as youth, human rights, partnerships and climate change throughout the seven subprogrammes, as indicated in paragraph 81 of the report.

6. Questions were raised about the inclusion of human rights as a cross-cutting issue in the programme. In that context, clarification was sought on the nature and the scope of the implementation of actions related to human rights. The opinion was expressed that UN-Habitat does not have any mandate in the field of human rights. Information was also requested on cooperation between UN-Habitat and other United Nations entities, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

7. Other delegations expressed the view that they did not share the concern over the inclusion of human rights as a cross-cutting issue.

8. In addition, delegations sought clarification on the use of the term "planned results" in paragraph 78 of the report and asked whether this was a new category being introduced as opposed to the agreed terminology of "expected accomplishments". Explanation was also sought on the "Project Advisory Group" "in-house peer review mechanism" discussed in paragraph 83 of the report, in particular, who are the members of the Group, what is the purpose of the entity and who constituted a "peer".

9. Some delegations sought clarification on the results-based budgeting methodology in general, and expressed their views on the development of better indicators of achievement.

10. A query was made on indicator of achievement (b) under subprogramme 1, Urban legislation, land and governance, on the approach to the implementation of programmes for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, indigenous people and minorities. Under the same subprogramme, a delegation expressed views on the formulation of the indicator of achievement (c) (i), in which the phrase "implementing the guidelines on decentralization" had been replaced with "adopted the guidelines on decentralization".

11. Under subprogramme 5, Housing and slum upgrading, clarification was sought on the use of the term "supranational authorities" in indicator of achievement (a) (i), and on the meaning of the expression "unlawful forced evictions" in indicator of achievement (a) (ii).

12. Some delegations sought clarification as to whether UN-Habitat had established criteria to identify projects under technical cooperation for implementation in a particular country. The view was expressed on the incorporation

of the post-2015 agenda into the programme of work of UN-Habitat and delivery of its programme in the Africa region, especially the least developed countries.

13. The view was expressed with regard to the importance of providing printed publications in lieu of electronic distribution in countries that have limited technology.

Conclusions and recommendations

14. **The Committee emphasized the need for UN-Habitat to develop synergies with other United Nations entities in the implementation of the Habitat Agenda.**

15. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 12, Human settlements, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75), subject to the following modifications:**

Delete the reference to "planned results" in the document.

Paragraph 83

In the second sentence, after the word "documents", add the phrase "including those to be implemented in countries which are not beneficiaries of the United Nations operational activities for development."

In the last sentence, delete the phrase "and that indicators are put in place to monitor human rights progress."

Subprogramme 1

In indicator of achievement (a), at the end of the phrase, add the words "with the technical support of UN-Habitat".

Subprogramme 3

In expected accomplishment (b), replace the word "targeted" with the word "partner".

Subprogramme 4

In expected accomplishment (a), after the words "implemented by", add the word "partner".

Reformulate indicator of achievement (a) as follows:

"Increased number of partner local, regional and national authorities implementing policies and the International Guidelines on Decentralization and Access to Basic Services for All".

Subprogramme 5

Reformulate indicator of achievement (a) (i) as follows:

"Number of local, regional and national authorities, as well as regional and international forums, organizations and partners, that have joined the Global Housing Strategy."

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.7

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
24 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015
(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Programme 10
Trade and development

1. At its 16th meeting, on 14 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

2. The Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) introduced the report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Appreciation was expressed for programme 10, Trade and development, of the biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of UNCTAD, especially in the context of subprogramme 5, Africa, least developed countries and special programmes.

4. Several delegations sought clarification as to whether UNCTAD had taken into account all the decisions emanating from its thirteenth session, held in Doha from 21 to 26 April 2012 (the Doha Mandate). In particular, delegations expressed

13-37141 (E) 250613

Please recycle

concern that the biennial programme plan did not reflect all the decisions of the Conference.

5. Concern was expressed by some delegations regarding the fact that, despite the holding of the thirteenth session of UNCTAD, the proposed programme budget did not fully take into account the Doha Mandate, especially with regard to middle-income countries.

6. Concern was also expressed with regard to the lack of consideration given to the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee at its fifty-second session, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/236.

7. One delegation expressed the view that the issue of middle-income countries was an important one. In that connection, it sought clarification regarding the phrases "some middle-income countries", "middle-income countries most in need" and "other relevant decisions". In particular, it wished to know who decided on the countries to which "some" referred, what was the basis for determining which middle-income countries were most in need and which were not and what was meant by "relevant". In addition, the delegation expressed concern regarding the inclusion of the term "relevant", given that the Committee, in its report on the work of its fifty-second session (A/67/16), had already recommended its deletion.

8. A number of delegations expressed concern regarding the omission of the term "middle-income countries" from the objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement of several subprogrammes, contrary to the specific recommendation of the Committee in its report (A/67/16).

9. The view was expressed that programme 10, Trade and development, should include the issue of sustainable development and that, while prioritizing the least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, it was essential for UNCTAD to cover all developing countries, including middle-income countries. In addition, the importance of integrating developed countries and their supply chains, with an emphasis on South-South cooperation and North-South cooperation, was stressed.

10. Lastly, a query was raised as to the direction of the discussion within the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD with regard to the special event and publications to mark the fiftieth anniversary of UNCTAD, in 2014.

Conclusions and recommendations

11. **The Committee noted that some of the changes to the narrative of programme 10, Trade and development, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/236, had not been reflected in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75). The Committee therefore reiterated the following:**

Overall orientation

Paragraph 20

At the end of the second sentence, delete the phrase "and other relevant decisions".

Subprogramme 2
Investment and enterprise

Indicators of achievement

In indicator of achievement (b) (ii), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

Strategy

Paragraph 24

In the last sentence, replace (b) with the following:

"(b) helping developing countries, middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition, at their request, to strengthen their capacity to formulate and implement integrated policies, develop an enabling environment and participate in discussions related to international investment;".

In the last sentence, replace (c) with the following:

"(c) supporting efforts by developing countries, middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition to build productive capacities and internationally competitive firms;".

Subprogramme 3
International trade

Component 1
Strengthening international trade

Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat

In expected accomplishment (b), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase ", middle-income countries".

In expected accomplishment (d), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase ", middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition".

Indicators of achievement

In indicator of achievement (d) (i), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

In indicator of achievement (d) (ii), after the phrase "developing countries", add the phrase "and countries with economies in transition".

Component 2
Commodities

Strategy

Paragraph 27

In the second sentence, after the word "Africa", add the words ", middle-income countries and countries with economies in transition,".

Subprogramme 4
Technology and logistics

Strategy

Paragraph 28

In the second sentence, after the word "Africa", add the phrase "middle-income countries, countries with economies in transition", and, after the phrase "small economies", delete ", as well as countries with economies in transition and some middle-income countries according to their needs".

12. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 10, Trade and development, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75) and in section 12 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/6 (Sect. 12)), subject to the following modifications:**

Subprogramme 2
Investment and enterprise

Objective of the Organization

After the words "as well as", add the phrase "middle-income countries, countries with economies in transition,".

Strategy

Paragraph 24

In the second sentence, delete the words "some" and "most in need".

*Outputs**

Paragraph 12.51, subparagraph (c) (i)

Replace the phrase "assistance to some middle-income countries that are most in need" with the phrase "assistance to middle-income countries, according to their needs, and to economies in transition".

Subprogramme 3
International trade

Component 1
Strengthening international trade

Strategy

Paragraph 26 (f)

Delete the word "some".

Paragraph 26 (i)

After the words "increased participation", add the words "and upscaling".

* See A/68/6 (Sect. 12).

Paragraph 26 (o)

Replace the paragraph with the following: "Addressing issues at the interface of trade and environment in the context of sustainable development, fostering low-carbon development, including through technology transfers, ensuring development gains and seizing trade opportunities related to the emerging climate change regime and the sustainable use of biodiversity."

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.8

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(*Item 3 (b)*)

Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (E/AC.51/2013/4)

1. At its 7th meeting, on 6 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (E/AC.51/2013/4).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the relevance of the report and stated that the results would be useful in learning about the important work being done by UNODC in helping countries respond to drug- and crime-related threats. In particular, they underscored the importance of the Office's technical assistance work in strengthening the capacity of Member States to set norms and adopt policies.

4. Some delegations expressed satisfaction with the Office's research and analysis work, in particular its annual *World Drug Report* and its surveys on illicit crop cultivation, as important sources to inform their decision-making processes. Others remarked that UNODC could improve the dissemination of its work and consider having a coherent communications strategy to enhance the effectiveness of its research and analysis work.

13-37316 (E) 260613

Please recycle

5. Concerns were expressed about the ability of UNODC to monitor results in the field, and to establish a fully operational integrated programming approach that responds to national priorities. Questions were also raised regarding the role that OIOS played in assisting UNODC to strengthen its evaluation capacity.

6. Delegations also expressed concern about the level of regular budget resources assigned to UNODC. In this regard, they recalled General Assembly resolution 67/193, in which the Assembly expressed its concern regarding the overall financial situation of UNODC, emphasized the need to improve the cost-effective utilization of resources by the Office and requested the Secretary-General to submit proposals in his proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 to ensure that the Office has sufficient resources to carry out its mandates.

7. The same delegations stressed the need for the Secretary-General to strictly implement the above-mentioned resolution while presenting his budgetary submission for the biennium 2014-2015.

8. Other delegations remarked that budget matters were not within the purview of the Committee.

9. Some delegations asked questions about the continued challenge facing the Office in meeting the needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries within the framework of increased earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions. One delegation expressed the view that UNODC could not be expected to deliver results given the high level of strict earmarking.

10. Concern was also expressed over the high level of earmarked contributions provided to the Office, and its negative impact on the implementation of its programme.

11. Concern was raised by several delegations regarding the OIOS recommendation on fundraising and earmarking (recommendation 4). Several delegations strongly supported the recommendation on setting a goal to reduce the earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions so as to enable UNODC to respond more effectively to the needs and priorities of Member States. Other delegations were equally strongly against the recommendation noting that it would not increase the availability of extrabudgetary resources.

12. A number of delegations expressed concern over the growing number of mandates given to UNODC and about the Office's arrangements for collaboration with other entities in order to respond to those mandates in a more effective manner.

13. Questions were raised by delegations on the regional approach to UNODC operations and the use of the logframe approach for the evaluation exercise, and they expressed their support for an integrated programme approach to UNODC operations.

14. Several delegations expressed full support for the results and conclusions of the report and to the recommendations contained therein.

Conclusions and recommendations

15. **The Committee noted the global nature of challenges confronting UNODC and recognized the effectiveness and the impact of the activities of the Office in the field, while acknowledging the specificities of its current structure.**

16. **The Committee emphasized, in particular, the value of the Office's provision of technical expertise in supporting the efforts of Member States, upon their request, in ratifying international instruments, as well as its role in mobilizing financial and technical assistance to meet the needs of Member States in their fight against drugs and crime.**

17. **The Committee further noted the value of UNODC research and analysis, and its publications, and considered that the findings of the evaluation report underlined the important contribution of the Office to capacity-building at both the regional and national levels.**

18. **The Committee also noted the need for a wider operational knowledge management strategy that could further leverage the Office's research and analysis work for potential impact.**

19. **The Committee appreciated the report of OIOS and took note of the recommendations contained therein.**

20. **Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed that the reference to counterfeiting in table 2 referred to the illicit trafficking of property.**

21. **The Committee stressed the need for UNODC to improve synergies with other United Nations entities, with the aim of increasing efficiency in programme delivery while avoiding duplication and overlapping.**

22. **While noting the information provided in the programme impact pathway for UNODC, the Committee emphasized that expected accomplishments and, where possible, indicators of achievement were included to measure achievements in the implementation of United Nations programmes by the Secretariat and not those of individual Member States.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.9

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015
(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Programme 16
Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific

1. At its 13th meeting, on 13 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

2. Representatives of the Secretary-General introduced the consolidated report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Appreciation and support were expressed for programme 16, Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific, of the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015 (A/67/6/Rev.1) and for the work of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in the region, which is home to two thirds of the world's population.

4. A view was expressed that activities should focus on the practical needs of countries concerned, in particular the least developed countries, including infrastructure financing, disaster risk reduction, poverty eradication, social security,

Please recycle

ageing, health and security. In the context of the overall work of ESCAP on global issues in the region, such as good governance, economic cooperation, climate change and food security, there was a need to carry out forward-looking analysis in those areas and to assist Member States so that efforts towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) would be country-led.

5. Information was sought on the outcome of the final review of the Commission's conference structure, including its subsidiary structure, which was undertaken at the Commission's sixty-ninth session.

6. Clarification was sought as to what specific changes had been made to the biennial programme plan for the period 2014-2015, taking into account the decisions emanating from General Assembly resolution 66/288, by which the Assembly endorsed the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled "The future we want". The question was also raised as to whether all of the regional commissions had modified their respective biennial programme plans.

7. One delegation emphasized the importance of ensuring that the activities of ESCAP would be in conformity with intergovernmental mandates, and in this regard highlighted activities with regard to "Delivering as one", a concept that was still under consideration by Member States.

8. Some delegations expressed their concern over the Secretariat's use of terms that do not have intergovernmental mandate under the section "other information", and emphasized that the narrative in the programme budget should be based on the approved narrative in the Strategic Framework. Those delegations considered that the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly should address this matter within the framework of its consideration of the proposed programme budget for 2014-2015.

9. Some delegations sought clarification on various aspects of the methodology of the results-based logical framework of ESCAP, including details on changes in indicators of achievement and an explanation of the linkages between the programme budget and the plan of action.

10. One delegation sought clarification regarding efforts to improve geographical representation and regarding available resources, both assessed and extrabudgetary, which was not normally predictable. With regard to available resources, clarification was sought as to whether the requirements for the mandates to be implemented by ESCAP or driven by budgetary constraints had been reflected therein. Another delegation noted that budgetary issues were not within the purview of the Committee.

11. A delegation expressed the view that in future biennial programme plans, under component 3 of subprogramme 8, Subregional activities for development, a new expected accomplishment and indicator of achievement should be included as follows: expected accomplishments: (c) Strengthened intraregional cooperation and integration for the promotion of inclusive and sustainable development, including through South-South cooperation; indicators of achievement: (c) Increase in the number of joint intraregional initiatives, programmes and projects between North and Central Asia with or through the ESCAP subregional office for North and Central Asia.

Conclusions and recommendations

12. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 16, Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75) and in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/6 (Sect. 19)).**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.10

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Coordination questions: New Partnership for Africa's Development

(Item 4 (b))

United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development

1. At its 12th meeting, on 12 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) (E/AC.51/2013/6).

2. The Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. In view of the ongoing health situation of President Nelson Mandela, all delegations acknowledged the President's significant lifelong contribution to South Africa and humanity, and expressed their wishes for his speedy recovery.

4. Delegations commended the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa for the comprehensiveness of the report. Moreover, they welcomed and expressed support for the work of the Office, in particular its role as coordinator of United Nations system support for NEPAD.

5. Delegations reaffirmed the priority of Africa in the global agenda and reiterated the importance of stepping up coordinated United Nations system support

Please recycle

for all sectoral priorities of the Organization's work on Africa. They observed some decline in the financial and staff resources devoted to Africa by some United Nations system entities. Some delegations expressed the need to align United Nations system support budget planning with the national and regional priorities of the African continent.

6. Delegations emphasized the need to continue to strengthen coherence within the United Nations system in support of Africa's development, in particular with respect to the ongoing consultations on the post-2015 development agenda. In that regard, some delegations emphasized the need to closely coordinate that process with the sustainable development goals, as mandated by the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), to ensure the continuation of United Nations support for the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals, in particular poverty eradication and health, and to ensure that sustainable development was central in the post-2015 development agenda.

7. While appreciating the significant achievements in economic, social and political issues, some delegations underscored that the post-2015 development agenda should take due consideration of the economic development challenges facing Africa, including emerging challenges such as climate change, the global financial and economic crisis, the food crisis and commodity price volatility.

8. Delegations emphasized the need to align the post-2015 development agenda with the priorities of Africa, as articulated in the recently adopted African Union Commission Strategic Plan 2014-2017. Delegations also emphasized that the post-2015 development agenda should build on the successes of the Millennium Development Goals and focus on structural transformation and inclusive growth, innovation and education, and human and social development.

9. Some delegations stressed the importance of the nexus between peace, security and development, and welcomed the increasing partnerships in support of Africa's development, including the TICAD (Tokyo International Conference on African Development) process, the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation and other bilateral strategic partnerships with Africa. In that regard, some delegations emphasized the need to strengthen the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa with adequate resources to enable it to effectively coordinate all the multilateral initiatives in support of Africa's development and to provide better support for the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency in the implementation of its priority areas, notably agriculture, through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, infrastructure development, through the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa, market access and trade facilitation, human and social development, and science and technology.

10. Delegations expressed support for United Nations monitoring of the Regional Coordination Mechanism, in particular on progress achieved in the implementation of the 10-year capacity-building programme for the African Union. Some delegations supported the call for a joint United Nations/African Union resource mobilization strategy and the creation of a trust fund to facilitate the implementation and coordination of activities of the business plans of the clusters within the Regional Coordination Mechanism. Delegations encouraged the various clusters to share more information among and between one another, to set up baselines and realistic targets and to show greater willingness and readiness to engage with one another.

11. Delegations emphasized the need to better mainstream the cross-cutting issues of the Regional Coordination Mechanism in the work of relevant clusters, thereby enabling the Mechanism more effectively to provide the necessary technical support to the African Union Commission, the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency and the regional economic communities, and to better facilitate the implementation of the multisectoral capacity-building programmes.

12. Delegations expressed the view that Africa's transition towards a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication should be viewed within the implementation of the outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference.

13. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the analysis given in paragraph 105 of the report, summarizing the challenges and constraints in the areas under consideration.

Conclusions and recommendations

14. **The Committee welcomed the annual report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for NEPAD (E/AC.51/2013/6) and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 106 to 114 of the report.**

15. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to include, in his future reports, detailed information related to the possible outcomes of the achievements of NEPAD targets.**

16. **The Committee also recommended that the General Assembly reiterate its request to the organizations of the United Nations system to continue to promote greater coherence in their work in support of NEPAD, on the basis of the agreed clusters of the Regional Coordination Mechanism in Africa, and called upon the United Nations system to continue to mainstream the special needs of Africa in all of its normative and operational activities, including the financing of programmes and projects, resource mobilization and humanitarian assistance.**

17. **The Committee further recommended that the General Assembly request the organizations of the United Nations system to continue to coordinate closely with the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency, as the technical body of the African Union, and other structures of the African Union Commission and the Partnership in order to further strengthen the implementation of the African Union/NEPAD African Action Plan 2010-2015.**

18. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly emphasize the need for the organizations of the United Nations system and intergovernmental bodies to continue to fully take into account the views, comments and/or input of the African Union and other regional mechanisms in their policy formulation and decision-making, including in the areas of mediation, political affairs and peace and security.**

19. **The Committee reiterated its recommendation that the reports of the Secretary-General on NEPAD include information not only on seminars, workshops and meetings but also on other tangible actions and results in respect of United Nations system support for projects of the Partnership**

throughout the African continent, while stressing that future reports should further enhance the focus on the impact, in both quantitative and qualitative terms, of the activities implemented by entities of the United Nations system in support of the Partnership, with respect to the resources.

20. **The Committee recognized the important role played by the development of hard infrastructure in Africa, in particular the railroads and highways, and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts in mobilizing United Nations system support in that area, in particular for the initiatives of the regional economic communities.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.11

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(*Item 3 (b)*)

Programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme

1. At its 4th meeting, on 4 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (E/AC.51/2013/2).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Many delegations noted with appreciation the high quality of the report, which they found useful and interesting. They generally agreed with its results and conclusions and supported its recommendations. In the view of delegations, the report showed how UNEP had faced challenges in the environmental area and had fulfilled its mandate effectively, in particular with regard to monitoring the state of the world's environment and guiding the transition to the green economy, as well as with its strong science base. A number of delegations further expressed agreement with statements in the OIOS report that called for more attention to be paid to capacity-building and the strengthening of the UNEP regional offices, in addition to enhancing presence at the national level.

13-37377 (E) 260613

Please recycle

4. Delegations also raised concerns about overlapping and unclear roles and inadequate coordination between UNEP and other United Nations entities within the environmental field, seeking further clarification on the reasons for and solutions to that issue. They called for increased cooperation with other United Nations entities, such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in the area of sustainable energy and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the area of science. A number of delegations emphasized that there was a need for more synergies between environmental conventions served by UNEP and for lower administrative costs to UNEP partners. A query was raised as to why no reference had been made in the report to poverty eradication, which was an important goal of sustainable development.

5. Several delegations discussed the recent United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, expressing their general support for its conclusions with regard to strengthening UNEP. The view was also expressed, however, that strengthening UNEP also required increased accountability.

6. Delegations sought clarification on some of the language used in the report, including "partnerships", "green economy" and "global green new deal", especially because they were concepts that had not yet been agreed upon by Member States. Further clarification was sought as to the reference made by OIOS in its report to "a lack of shared understanding regarding the UNEP regional and global work programmes and activities". Explanation was also sought regarding the use of federated resource mobilization policies. Furthermore, one delegation expressed concern regarding the prioritization by UNEP of its activities given its high level of donor funding.

7. A few delegations also commented on the structure and number of posts being funded from the programme budget, saying that they would have expected some review and more action-oriented comments regarding the earmarking of resources received by UNEP. As to resources, a number of delegations said that resource discussions were not the purview of the Committee and would be addressed in another forum. Clarification was sought as to what was meant by developing "stronger programme planning and management processes", in addition to any lessons learned and comparative advantages.

8. With regard to the methodology of the OIOS report, delegations asked about the low response rate (33 per cent) to the survey of the States members of the UNEP Governing Council, how the survey had been conducted and OIOS verification of the data reported.

Conclusions and recommendations

9. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly should approve all the recommendations contained in the report of OIOS.**

10. **With regard to recommendation 1, the Committee also recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to further increase transparency and accountability to Member States.**

11. **The Committee recognized that UNEP had achieved positive results in addressing a broad range of environmental issues, had been critical to the development of global environmental norms and standards and had achieved positive results in building the capacity of national Governments.**

12. The Committee noted the efforts under way to strengthen UNEP and the role of the organization in promoting the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system.

13. In that regard, the Committee stressed the importance of promoting a balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, in addition to coordination within the United Nations system.

14. The Committee welcomed the efforts of UNEP to strengthen capacity-building support services in line with the needs and priorities of Member States.

United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.12

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015

Programme 3
Disarmament

1. At its 13th meeting, on 13 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 (A/68/75).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament introduced the report and responded to queries raised by the Committee during its consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Appreciation and support were expressed for the programme and the work of the Office for Disarmament Affairs. Delegations noted the explanations provided for changes, which were introduced in the overall orientation of the programme and subprogrammes 1 and 5.

4. The view was expressed that detailed information should be provided to have a clear understanding of the proposed changes and to better assist the Committee in making good recommendations to the General Assembly.

13-37383 (E) 260613

Please recycle

5. A number of delegations expressed concern regarding the presentation of the changes resulting from the movement, from subprogramme 1 to subprogramme 5, of activities associated with expected accomplishment (c) and the related indicators of achievement (c) (i), (ii) and (iii) linked to the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme.

6. Some delegations questioned the need for presenting changes in the programme at the current stage, in the absence of new mandates that justified such changes. In that context, they questioned, in particular, the proposal to transfer the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme from Geneva to New York. Further explanation was sought to determine the rationale and the added value of such a transfer, taking into account that the centre of disarmament issues was located in Geneva. The view was expressed that such a proposal would create difficulties for some delegations and queries were raised to clarify the efficiencies to be gained by the Secretariat as a result. In addition, delegations expressed the opinion that, in practical terms, the proposal to transfer the Fellowship Programme to subprogramme 5 would give priority to regional issues over those of a global nature. Clarification was sought as to how the Office for Disarmament Affairs envisaged compliance with General Assembly resolutions, for example in ensuring geographical representation and gender balance in the selection of candidates for the Fellowship Programme.

7. Concern was expressed about the proposal to change the title of the branch which had substantive responsibility for the implementation of subprogramme 1, Multilateral negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament, from the "Conference on Disarmament Secretariat and Conference Support Branch" at the United Nations Office at Geneva, to the "Geneva Branch". The view was expressed that despite the explanations provided by the Secretariat, such a proposal decreased the visibility of the activities performed by the Secretariat related to the Conference on Disarmament. While it was noted that the objective of the proposal to change the title was to shorten and simplify the name, the view was also expressed that the name change itself did not reflect the mandate of the Office. Moreover, it would have some implications and would detract from the importance of the Conference.

8. Some delegations expressed serious concern about such a proposal and sought clarification regarding the impact of the name change at the intergovernmental level and whether prior consultations had been held with Member States on the proposal.

9. Clarification was also sought regarding the expectation of the Secretariat concerning the strategy related to furthering collaboration with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, as reflected in paragraph 7 of the report (A/68/75), and whether the Secretariat collaborated with similar institutes in New York.

10. A few delegations noted the changes in the organizational structure and post distribution as reflected in annex I to document A/68/6 (Sect. 4), in particular under subprogramme 2. They expressed concern about the impact of those changes on programme delivery, given the move of one post at the D-1 level from subprogramme 5 to subprogramme 2. In that connection, clarification was sought regarding the rationale for having two posts at the D-1 level under subprogramme 2 as a result of that change.

11. Concern was expressed by some delegations with regard to peace and security in Central Africa. Clarification was sought as to whether the situation in the Sahel region and the impact of the dissemination of arms on all States in the region, was taken into account, together with the inclusion of specific measures to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

12. Further clarification was sought regarding the recommendations made by the Secretariat to combat the illicit circulation of conventional weapons and strengthen the customary actions of the United Nations to serve peace and security in Central Africa.

13. Some delegations sought clarification about the impact of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in particular the transfer of appropriate technology for peaceful uses, as a particular narrative to that effect had not been provided under the expected accomplishments of the programme.

14. The need for consultation with the First Committee on the proposed changes was also highlighted by some delegations.

Conclusions and recommendations

15. **The Committee, at the current stage, did not recommend that the General Assembly approve the proposed changes to the narrative of programme 3, Disarmament, contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/68/75).**